REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-44 are in the application. Claims 1, 9, 15 and 25 are in independent form.

Claims 1-4, 7-12, and 15-18 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 for obviousness over Center for Metalloenzyme Studies: Summer Undergraduate Research Program ("SURP").

Claim 1 is a method of encouraging completion of forms through the introduction "during forms processing of appropriate communication to the applicant . . . "

SURP teaches viewing faculty advisor web pages before the student begins to complete the form, not "during forms processing." SURP states "[F]irst visit this page to select your three choices of faculty advisor, then submit the online application form at the bottom of this page . . ."

Applicant addresses and solves the problem of individuals beginning to complete a form and then failing to complete it. The number of admissions application received by a school can be reduced because some students that begin a lengthy admissions form lack the motivation to complete the form. By encouraging completion of a form once started, the number of admissions applications can be increased. This problem is not addressed in SURP, in which the links are accessed before beginning the form. Taking the SURP reference as a whole for what it teaches, it teaches selecting a faculty advisor and then completing a form.

Similarly, claim 9 recites "introducing during the form-completion process an appropriate communication to a user" and "displaying the communication to the user upon the occurrence of an event during completion of the form." [Emphasis added.] As describe above, the display of the faculty advisors in not "during completion of the form." Claim 15 recites a similar limitation.

Regarding claims 3, 10, and 16, the Examiner points out that SURP teaches providing a means of communicating with the identified individual. Claim 3 recites, however, that the means to communicate is provided "after" completing the form, thereby providing incentive to complete the form. Providing the means to communicate after completing the form also reduce the burden on the individual from the institution. because he or she is not bothered by communications from individuals that are not sufficiently interested in the institution to complete the form. In SURP, the e-mail address of the faculty is available before the form is even begun. Thus, SURP does not provide the incentive to complete the form in order to be given the means to communicate.

-8-

Claim 8 explicitly recites that the "individual cannot be contacted until the user completes the form." The Examiner states in paragraph 10 of the Office action that SURP "teaches providing to the user a response when an application is completed, the response containing a message from an individual associated with the university and a means of contacting the individual. This means of contact is available only after a user completes the application and submits it." Applicants fail to find this limitation in SURP. It appears that the student can link to the faculty web site and learn the faculty members' e-mail before completing the form. Moreover, applicants see no indication in SURP that the student receives a message from the faculty member after competing the form.

Regarding claims 11 and 17, the Examiner states that it would have been obvious to use a pop-up window in SURP. Applicants submit that there is no incentive to modify SURP to use a pop-up window because in SURP, the faculty web page is viewed to select an advisor before completing the form. SURP does not teach displaying information during the process of completing the form, so there is no reason to use a pop-up window, which is useful while completing the form, since it does remove the form from the screen and is therefore less distractive.

Claims 5, 6, 13, 14, ad 19-27 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 for obviousness over SURP in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,249,291 to Popp et al. ("Popp"). Applicants submit that these claims are patentable for the reason describe above with respect to the corresponding independent claims.

Claims 28-44 are added to more completely claim the invention. These claims further differentiate over Popp. In Popp, a response HTML page is dynamically generated by a server in response to receiving a page submitted by a user. The content of the generated HTML page can depend upon the information submitted by a user. All of the logic in determining the response is performed at the server. This is shown, for example, in FIG. 2, which shows, for example, CGIMessenger, application, and database in the server domain 208. FIGS. 3A, 9A, and 9B also show that the logic is performed at the server. Col. 15, lines 44-54, states: "The present invention provides an extension to HTML that is used on the HTTP server side. The HTML extension is filtered out before a Web page is sent to a client browser. It is used to interpret an HTML template and to render an HTML document before is transmitted to the client browser. Because HTML extensions are not sent to the client browser, there is no need for a client

-9-

browser to support these extensions. Thus, existing client browsers that support the standard HTML can be used to display HTML documents using the present invention."

Page 11, lines 2-5, of applicants' specification describes that a program, such as a JavaScript program, can be incorporated into an HTML page, and the program can specify or assembly information to be presented to the user to provide static, conditional, and dynamic pages to the user. Many of the added claims relate to forms including logic, content, or both for providing a communication or information to a user completing a form.

Including logic, content, or both in the form itself, rather than sending back to the server to create and send a new web page as taught by Popp, means that the communication to the user can be quicker and less disruptive to the form completion process. This encourages the user while he or she is completing the form. A long wait in the middle of completing the form would discourage, rather than encourage, forms completion. By eliminating the need to post the form back to the server, for the server to determine the next page, and then to transmit the new page to the user, the communication to the user is more immediate and less disruptive.

While skilled persons may have avoided including the logic, alternative content, or both in the original form because it could increase the size of the form and increase download time, applicants recognized that it is acceptable to have a longer form to facilitate communications during the forms completion process.

Amendments to the existing claims are for clarity or broadening, and are not narrowing amendments.

Applicants submit that the claims are allowable for the reasons described above and respectfully requests the application be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: __11/6/03__   By: _____

Michael O. Scheinberg
Patent Attorney
Reg. No.: 36,919
P.O. Box 164140
Austin, TX 78716-4140
Telephone: (512) 328-9510
Facsimile: (512) 306-1963

-10-